

RELATIVISTIC EFFECTS IN QUASIELASTIC ELECTRON SCATTERING

MARIA B. BARBARO

*Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica - Università di Torino and
INFN, Via P. Giuria 1, 10125 Turin, Italy*

Electron scattering is known to be one of the most powerful means to study both the structure of nuclei and the internal structure of the nucleon, especially the less known strange and axial form factors. In particular, inclusive (e,e') processes at or near quasielastic peak kinematics have attracted attention in the last two decades and several experiments have been performed with the aim of disentangling the longitudinal and transverse contributions to the quasielastic cross section. These are linked to the hadronic tensor

$$W^{\mu\nu} = \overline{\sum_i} \sum_f \langle f | \hat{J}^\mu | i \rangle^* \langle f | \hat{J}^\nu | i \rangle \delta(E_i + \omega - E_f) \quad (1)$$

via the relations

$$R^L(q, \omega) = \left(\frac{q^2}{Q^2} \right)^2 \left[W^{00} - \frac{\omega}{q} (W^{03} + W^{30}) + \frac{\omega^2}{q^2} W^{33} \right] \quad (2)$$

$$R^T(q, \omega) = W^{11} + W^{22}, \quad (3)$$

where $Q_\mu = (\omega, \mathbf{q})$ is the four-momentum carried by the virtual photon, $\hat{J}^\mu$ is the nuclear many-body current operator and the nuclear states $|i\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ are exact eigenstates of the nuclear Hamiltonian with definite four-momentum. The general form (1) includes all possible final states that can be reached through the action of the current operator $\hat{J}^\mu$ on the exact ground state; here we focus on the one-particle one-hole (1p-1h) excitations.

The simple impulse approximation, while explaining the electron scattering reaction mechanism around the quasielastic peak reasonably well, is unable to account for the observed strength in the dip region between the quasielastic and Δ peaks, where meson production, including via the Δ , and two-body currents should be taken into account.

Most of the existing calculations that include nuclear correlations have been performed within a non-relativistic framework, where non-relativistic wave functions and current operators are obtained using standard expansions which view both the momentum transfer q and the energy transfer ω as being small compared to the nucleon mass m . For high-energy conditions the current operators so obtained are obviously inadequate and new expressions are needed. This provided the focus for the developments in [1, 2, 3], where new current operators that are exact as far as the variables ω and q are concerned were derived.




Figure 1. Feynman diagrams representing the seagull (a and b), pion-in-flight (c), vertex (d and e) and self-energy of the hole (f) and particle (g) particle-hole matrix elements.

Since the physics of the QEP is remote not only from the physical surface of the nucleus, but from the Fermi surface as well, we consider a treatment in terms of nucleonic and mesonic degrees of freedom (the latter viewed both as force and current carriers) to be appropriate. Hence, as a first step, we focus on pions, as they can be expected under these conditions to be the major carrier of the currents that respond to an external electromagnetic field impinging on the nucleus. Moreover, since the effects of pions on the free responses of the relativistic Fermi gas are not expected to be too disruptive, the interaction is dealt with in first order of perturbation theory, which amounts to consider the many-body Feynman diagrams in Fig. 1: they represent all the possible processes involving one and only one pionic line and connecting the Fermi sphere $|F\rangle$ to a 1p-1h excited state. Diagrams (a)-(c) correspond to the usual meson-exchange current

$$\begin{aligned} \langle ph^{-1} | \hat{j}_\mu^{MEC} | F \rangle = & -\frac{mf^2 F_1^{(V)} i\varepsilon_{3ab}}{V^2 m_\pi^2 \sqrt{E_{\mathbf{p}} E_{\mathbf{h}}}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{m}{E_{\mathbf{k}}} \bar{u}(\mathbf{p}) \tau_a \tau_b \left\{ \frac{(\mathbf{K} - m) \gamma_\mu}{(P - K)^2 - m_\pi^2} \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{\gamma_\mu (\mathbf{K} - m)}{(K - H)^2 - m_\pi^2} - 2m \frac{(Q + 2H - 2K)_\mu (\mathbf{K} - m)}{[(P - K)^2 - m_\pi^2][(K - H)^2 - m_\pi^2]} \right\} u(\mathbf{h}) \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

where the electromagnetic field is coupled with the pionic current (V in the volume enclosing the system and f is the π -nucleon coupling constant); diagrams (d)-(g) contain an intermediate virtual nucleon, described by the Feynman propagator S_F , and give rise to the so-called correlation current ($\Gamma^\mu = F_1\gamma^\mu + iF_2\sigma^{\mu\nu}Q_\nu/2m$ being the single-nucleon e.m. current):

$$\begin{aligned} \langle ph^{-1}|\hat{j}_\mu^C|F\rangle = & -\frac{1}{2m}\frac{mf^2}{V^2m_\pi^2\sqrt{E_{\mathbf{p}}E_{\mathbf{h}}}}\sum_{\mathbf{k}}\frac{m}{E_{\mathbf{k}}}\bar{u}(\mathbf{p})\left\{\tau_a\gamma_5\frac{P-K}{(P-K)^2-m_\pi^2}\right. \\ & (K+m)[\tau_a\gamma_5(P-K)S_F(H+Q)\Gamma_\mu(Q)+\Gamma_\mu(Q)S_F(K-Q)\tau_a\gamma_5 \\ & (P-K)]+[\tau_a\gamma_5(K-H)S_F(K+Q)\Gamma_\mu(Q)+\Gamma_\mu(Q)S_F(P-Q)\tau_a\gamma_5 \\ & (K-H)](K+m)\tau_a\gamma_5\frac{K-H}{(K-H)^2-m_\pi^2}\left.\right\}u(\mathbf{h}) . \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The inclusion of the latter is crucial for fulfilling gauge invariance: indeed it can be proved [4] that the relativistic MEC and correlation currents satisfy current conservation, *i.e.*

$$Q^\mu\langle ph^{-1}|\hat{j}_\mu^{MEC}+\hat{j}_\mu^C|F\rangle=0 , \quad (6)$$

provided the same isovector electromagnetic form factor $F_1^{(V)}$ enters in all of the currents.




Figure 2. Longitudinal response versus ω including all first-order contributions (dashed) compared with the free result (solid) at $q=0.5$ (a), 1 (b), 2 (c) and 3 (d) GeV/c. Here and in all of the figures to follow the nucleus is ^{40}Ca with $k_F=237$ MeV/c and the units are 10^{-1} MeV $^{-1}$ at $q=0.5$ GeV/c, 10^{-2} MeV $^{-1}$ at $q=1$ GeV/c, 10^{-3} MeV $^{-1}$ at $q=2$ GeV/c and 10^{-4} MeV $^{-1}$ at $q=3$ GeV/c.




Figure 3. Same as Fig. 1 for the transverse response.

The numerical results are displayed in Figs. 2 and 3, where the global responses in first order of perturbation theory are compared with the free ones for several momentum transfers. The overall effect of the two-body currents appears sufficiently modest to justify our first-order treatment. Moreover, the softening at large q appears to be common to both L and T channels, whereas at low q the longitudinal response displays a hardening that is absent in the transverse one. Also evident is the almost vanishing of the two-body correlation contribution at the peak of the free responses.

A detailed analysis of the separate contributions of the diagrams in Fig. 1 is presented in Refs. [4, 5]. Here we summarize the main results:

- the MEC are almost irrelevant in the longitudinal channel, whereas their contribution typically amounts to about 5–10% in the transverse one;
- the impact of the correlation current is substantial in both the longitudinal and transverse responses, though it is actually dominant in the former, due to the smallness of the isoscalar magnetic moment;
- the MEC and correlations effects tend to cancel in the transverse channel, especially for low values of q , whereas for higher values of the momentum transfer the MEC dominate;
- the self-energy contribution arises from a delicate cancellation of diagrams 1f and 1g, as already pointed out in Ref. [6] in a semi-relativistic context.

To stress the relevance of relativistic effects, in Fig. 4 we compare the MEC

contribution to the transverse response with the non-relativistic calculation of [7] for $q = 500$ MeV/c. It clearly appears that, apart from the difference stemming from the relativistic kinematics which shrinks the response domain, the relativistic responses are about 30% smaller than the non-relativistic ones, indicating that *relativity plays an important role even for not so high q -values.*




Figure 4. Transverse MEC contribution (solid) compared with the non-relativistic calculation of Ref. [7] (dashed).

We can now study the evolution of the MEC and correlations with the momentum transfer and with the density. Such dependences are clearly relevant in connection with analyses of scaling in nuclei [8], both of first and second kinds. From our results it emerges that:

- *scaling of first kind (independence of q) is attained at high momentum transfer;*
- *scaling of second kind (independence of k_F) is broken through dependence roughly on the Fermi momentum squared for all values of q .*

This point is best illustrated by displaying the responses as functions of the scaling variable[8]

$$\psi \equiv \frac{E_0 - m}{E_F - m}, \quad (7)$$

where E_F is the Fermi energy and E_0 the minimum energy needed for a nucleon inside the Fermi sphere to participate to the scattering process.

In Fig. 5a the ratio R_{MEC}^T/R_{free}^T is plotted for q varying from 0.5 to 3 GeV/c: the relative MEC contribution decreases in going from 0.5 to 1 GeV/c, but then it rapidly saturates at $q \simeq 1$ GeV/c, where its value stabilizes, typically around 10%. Thus scaling of the first kind is satisfied. In Fig. 5b the same ratio is plotted versus ψ at $q=1$ GeV/c for k_F varying from 200 to 300 MeV/c: it clearly appears that the relative MEC contributions grow with k_F (attaining a value of about 20% at $k_F = 300$ MeV/c),

indicating that the MEC content of R^T increases with the density roughly as k_F^2 , in contrast with the free response which decreases as k_F^{-1} . Similar




Figure 5. The ratio MEC/free in the transverse channel plotted versus ψ at $k_F=237$ MeV/c for various values of q (in GeV/c) in panel a and for various values of k_F (in MeV/c) at $q=1$ GeV/c in panel b.

results hold for the correlation contributions[4]. We can thus conclude that the pionic effects in the reponse functions *do not go away* as q becomes very large and attain scaling of the first kind at momentum transfers somewhat above 1 GeV/c, while scaling of the second kind is badly violated.

Acknowledgments: I would like to thank J.E. Amaro, J.A. Caballero, T.W. Donnelly and A. Molinari, who have collaborated in this work.

References

1. J.E. Amaro, M.B. Barbaro, J.A. Caballero, T.W. Donnelly, A. Molinari, Nucl. Phys. **A643** (1998) 349.
2. J.E. Amaro, M.B. Barbaro, J.A. Caballero, T.W. Donnelly, A. Molinari, Nucl. Phys. **A657** (1999) 161.
3. L. Alvarez-Ruso, M.B. Barbaro, T.W. Donnelly, A. Molinari, Phys. Lett. **B497** (2001) 214.
4. J.E. Amaro, M.B. Barbaro, J.A. Caballero, T.W. Donnelly, A. Molinari, nucl-th/0106035, to be published in Nucl. Phys. **A**.
5. J.E. Amaro, M.B. Barbaro, J.A. Caballero, T.W. Donnelly, A. Molinari, nucl-th/0107069, submitted to Nucl. Phys. **A**.
6. W.M. Alberico, M.B. Barbaro, A. De Pace, T.W. Donnelly, A. Molinari, Nucl. Phys. **A563** (1993) 605.
7. J.E. Amaro, G. Co', A.M. Lallena, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **E3** (1994) 735.
8. T.W. Donnelly, Ingo Sick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999) 3212 and Phys. Rev. **C60**:065502 (1999); W.M. Alberico, A. Molinari, T.W. Donnelly, E.L. Kronenberg, J.W. Van Orden, Phys. Rev. **C38** (1988) 1801.